arXiv:1303.7349v1 [math.PR] 29 Mar 2013

Perturbations of Functional Inequalities for Lévy Type Dirichlet Forms*

Xin Chen$^{b)}$, **Feng-Yu Wang**$^{a),c)}$ **and Jian Wang**$^{d)}$

$^{a)}$School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China

$^{b)}$Grupo de Fisica Matematica, Universidade de Lisboa, Av Prof Gama Pinto 2, Lisbon 1649-003, Portugal

$^{c)}$Department of Mathematics, Swansea University, Singleton Park, SA2 8PP, United Kingdom

$^{d)}$School of Mathematics and Computer Science, Fujian Normal University, Fuzhou 350007, China

chenxin_217@hotmail.com, wangfy@bnu.edu.cn, F.-Y.Wang@swansea.ac.uk, jianwang@fjnu.edu.cn

April 1, 2013

Abstract

Perturbations of super Poincaré and weak Poincaré inequalities for Lévy type Dirichlet forms are studied. When the range of jumps is finite our results are natural extensions to the corresponding ones derived earlier for diffusion processes; and we show that the study for the situation with infinite range of jumps is essentially different. Some examples are presented to illustrate the optimality of our results.

AMS subject Classification: 60J75, 47G20, 60G52.
Keywords: Super Poincaré inequality; weak Poincaré inequality; Lévy type Dirichlet form; perturbation.

1 Introduction

Functional inequalities of Dirichlet forms are powerful tools in the study of Markov semigroups and spectral theory of Dirichlet operators, see [1, 6, 8, 14] for accounts on functional inequalities and applications. To establish a functional inequality, one often needs

---

*Supported in part by Lab. Math. Com. Sys., NNSFC(11131003 and 11201073), SRFDP, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, the Program for New Century Excellent Talents in Universities of Fujian (No. JA11051 and JA12053) and the Portuguese Science Foundation (FCT) for the project "Probabilistic approach to finite and infinite dimensional dynamical systems" (No. PTDC/MAT/104173/2008).

to verify some conditions on the generator, for instances the Bakry-Emery curvature condition in the diffusion setting or the Lyapunov condition in a general setting, see e.g. [3, 9, 14]. Since these conditions exclude generators with less regular coefficients, to establish functional inequalities in a more general setting one treats the singularity part as a perturbation. So, it is important to investigate perturbations of functional inequalities.

In [2], sharp growth conditions have been presented for perturbations of super Poincaré and weak Poincaré inequalities in the diffusion setting (i.e. the underlying Dirichlet form is local). Note that these two kinds of functional inequalities are general enough to cover all Poincaré/Sobolev/Nash type inequalities, and thus, have a broad range of applications. Recently, explicit sufficient conditions were derived in [4, 5, 10, 15] for functional inequalities of stable-like Dirichlet forms. The aim of this paper is to extend perturbation results derived in [2] to the non-local setting, so that combining with the existing sufficient conditions we are able to establish functional inequalities for more general Dirichlet forms. Due to the lack of the chain rule, the study of the non-local setting is usually more complicated. Nevertheless, we are able to present some relatively clean perturbation results, which are sharp as illustrated by some examples latter on, and when the range of jumps is finite, are natural extensions to the corresponding results derived earlier for diffusion processes.

Let (E, d) be a Polish space equipped with the Borel σ-field $\mathscr{F}$ and a probability measure μ. Let $\mathscr{B}(E)$ be the set of all measurable functions on E, and let $\mathscr{B}_b(E)$ be the set of all bounded elements in $\mathscr{B}(E)$. Let $q \in \mathscr{B}(E \times E)$ be non-negative with $q(x,x) = 0, x \in E$, such that

$$\lambda := \sup_{x \in E} \int_E \big(1 \wedge d(x,y)^2\big) q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y) < \infty. \tag{1.1}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\Gamma(f,g)(x) := \int_E (f(x) - f(y))(g(x) - g(y)) q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y), \quad \forall x \in E, \\ &f, g \in \mathscr{A} := \big\{ f \in \mathscr{B}_b(E) : \Gamma(f,f) \in \mathscr{B}_b(E) \big\} \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

gives rise to a non-negatively definite bilinear map from $\mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{A}$ to $\mathscr{B}_b(E)$. We assume that $\mathscr{A}$ is dense in $L^2(\mu)$. Then it is standard that the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{E}(f,g) : &= \mu(\Gamma(f,g)) \\ &= \iint_{E \times E} (f(x) - f(y))(g(x) - g(y)) q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x), \quad f, g \in \mathscr{A} \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

is closable in $L^2(\mu)$ and its closure $(\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}))$ is a symmetric conservative Dirichlet form, see e.g. [7, Example 1.2.6]. A typical example of the framework is the α-stable-like Dirichlet form, where $E = \mathbb{R}^m$ with $d(x,y) = |x - y|$, and

$$q(x,y) = \frac{\tilde{q}(x,y)}{u(y)|x-y|^{m+\alpha}}, \quad \mu(\mathrm{d}x) = u(x)\mathrm{d}x$$

for some $\alpha \in (0,2)$, non-negative $\tilde{q} \in \mathscr{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m)$, and positive $u \in \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that $\mu(\mathrm{d}x)$ is a probability measure. In this case we have $\mathscr{A} \supset C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$ which is dense in $L^2(\mu)$ for any probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^m$.

To investigate perturbations of functional inequalities using growth conditions as in [2], we fix a point $o \in E$ and denote $\rho(x) = d(o,x), x \in E$. Now, for a ρ-locally bounded measurable function V on E (i.e. V is bounded on the set $\{x \in E : \ \rho(x) \le r\}$ for all $r > 0$) such that $\mu(\mathrm{e}^V) = 1$, let $\mu_V(\mathrm{d}x) = \mathrm{e}^{V(x)}\mu(\mathrm{d}x)$. Since for every $f \in \mathscr{A}$, $\Gamma(f,f)$ given by (1.2) is a bounded measurable function on E, we have

$$\mathscr{E}_V(f,f) := \int_E \Gamma(f,f)(x)\,\mu_V(\mathrm{d}x) < \infty.$$

Again by the argument in [7, Example 1.2.6], the form

$$\mathscr{E}_V(f,g) := \mu_V(\Gamma(f,g)) = \iint_{E\times E} (f(x)-f(y))(g(x)-g(y))q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu_V(\mathrm{d}x)$$

defined for $f, g \in \mathscr{A}$ is closable in $L^2(\mu_V)$ and its closure $(\mathscr{E}_V, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V))$ is a symmetric conservative Dirichlet form.

In this paper, we shall assume that $\mathscr{E}$ satisfies a functional inequality and then search for conditions on V such that $\mathscr{E}_V$ satisfies the same type of functional inequality. In the following two sections, we study perturbations of the super Poincaré inequality and the weak Poincaré inequality respectively. Each section includes some typical examples to illustrate the main results. Throughout the paper, we simply denote that $\Gamma(f) = \Gamma(f,f)$, $\mathscr{E}(f) = \mathscr{E}(f,f)$ and $\mathscr{E}_V(f) = \mathscr{E}_V(f,f)$.

2 Perturbations of the super Poincaré inequality

In Subsection 2.1 we state two results for perturbations of the super Poincaré inequality using growth conditions and present some examples to illustrate the results. Subsection 2.2 includes proofs of these results. Finally, in Subsection 2.3 we prove that the super Poincaré inequality is stable for perturbations under a variation condition on the support of q, which extends a known result for diffusion processes.

2.1 Main results and examples

We consider the following super Poincaré inequality introduced in [12, 13]:

$$\mu(f^2) \le r\mathscr{E}(f) + \beta(r)\mu(|f|)^2, \quad r > 0, f \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}), \tag{2.1}$$

where $\beta : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ is a decreasing function. Note that if (2.1) holds for some non-decreasing function β, it holds also for the decreasing function $\tilde{\beta}(r) := \inf_{s\in(0,r]} \beta(s)$ in place of $\beta(r)$.

To establish a super Poincaré inequality for $\mathscr{E}_V$, we need the following quantities. For any $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$, let

$$\begin{aligned} K_{n,k}(V) &= \sup_{\rho(x)\leq n+2} V(x) - \inf_{\rho(x)\leq n+k+2} V(x), \\ J_{n,k}(V) &= \sup_{\rho(x)\leq n+1} V(x) - 2\inf_{\rho(x)\leq n+k+2} V(x), \\ \varepsilon_{n,k}(V) &= \sup_{m\geq n} \Big\{\beta^{-1}\big(1/[2\mu(\rho > m-1)]\big)\mathrm{e}^{K_{m,k}(V)}\Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta^{-1}(s) := \inf\{r > 0 : \beta(r) \leq s\}$ for $s > 0$, with $\inf \emptyset := \infty$ by convention.

When the jump is of finite range, i.e. there exists $k_0 > 0$ such that $q(x, y) = 0$ for $d(x, y) > k_0$, we have the following result similar to [2, Theorem 3.1] for local Dirichlet forms.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that* (2.1) *holds and there exists* $k_0 \geq 1$ *such that* $q(x, y) = 0$ *for* $d(x, y) > k_0$.

(1) *If* $\inf_{n\geq 1,k\geq k_0} \varepsilon_{n,k}(V) = 0$, *then the super Poincaré inequality* (2.5) *holds with*

$$\beta_V(r) := \inf\Big\{(1 + 8\lambda r')\mathrm{e}^{J_{n,k}(V)}\beta(s) : s > 0, r' \in (0, r], n \geq 1, k \geq k_0 \\ \text{such that } 8\varepsilon_{n,k}(V) + s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}(V)} \leq \frac{r'}{2 + 16\lambda r'}\Big\}.$$

(2) *If* $\inf_{n\geq 1,k\geq k_0} \varepsilon_{n,k}(V) < \infty$, *then the defective Poincaré inequality*

$$\mu_V(f^2) \leq C_1\mathscr{E}_V(f) + C_2\mu_V(|f|)^2, \quad f \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V) \tag{2.2}$$

holds for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$.

We note that according to [11, Proposition 1.3] (see also [14, Proposition 4.1.2]), if $\mathscr{E}_V$ satisfies the weak Poincaré inequality (see Section 4 below) then the defective Poincaré inequality (2.2) implies the Poincaré inequality

$$\mu_V(f^2) \leq C\mathscr{E}_V(f), \quad f \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V), \mu_V(f) = 0$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

When the jump is of infinite range, we will need additional notation and assumptions to control the uniform norm appearing in the perturbed functional inequalities (see Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7 below), which is an essentially different feature from the diffusion setting. For any $n, k \geq 1$ and $\delta > 1$, let

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n(V) &= \sup_{\rho(x)\leq n+1} V(x), \\ \zeta_n(V) &= \sup_{m\geq n} \Big\{\beta^{-1}\big(1/[2\mu(\rho > m-1)]\big)\mathrm{e}^{Z_{m+1}(V)}\Big\}, \\ t_{i,n,k}(\delta, V) &:= \beta^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{4}\delta^i \mathrm{e}^{-J_{n,k}(V)}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, let

$$\gamma_{n,k} = \iint_{\{d(x,y)>k,\rho(y)\geq n-1\}} q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x),$$
$$\eta_{n,k} = \iint_{\{\rho(x)>n+k+2,\rho(y)\leq n+1\}} q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x).$$

By (1.1), we see that $\gamma_{n,k}+\eta_{n,k}\downarrow 0$ as $n\uparrow\infty$ holds for any $k\geq 1$.
We assume

(A) There exist $\delta>1$ and sequences $\{(n_i,k_i)\}_{i\geq1}\subset\mathbb{N}^2$ such that $n_i\uparrow\infty$ and

(A1) $\lim_{i\to\infty}(\varepsilon_{n_i,k_i}(V)+t_{i,n_i,k_i}(\delta,V)\mathrm{e}^{K_{n_i,k_i}(V)})=0$;

(A2) $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left\{\zeta_{n_i}(V)\gamma_{n_i,k_i}+t_{i,n_i,k_i}(\delta,V)\mathrm{e}^{Z_{n_i}(V)}\eta_{n_i,k_i}\right\}<\infty$.

We shall let I_δ denote the set of all sequences $\{(n_i,k_i)\}\subset\mathbb{N}^2$ such that $n_i\uparrow\infty$ and (A1)-(A2) hold. Moreover, for any $r>0$ and $\{n_i,k_i\}\in I_\delta$, let $D(r,\{(n_i,k_i)\})$ be the set of $j\in\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sup_{i\geq j}\left(8\varepsilon_{n_i,k_i}(V)+t_{i,n_i,k_i}(\delta,V)\mathrm{e}^{K_{n_i,k_i}(V)}\right)\leq\frac{1}{64\lambda}\wedge\frac{c(\delta)r}{16},\quad i\geq j, \tag{2.3}$$

where $c(\delta):=\left(\frac{\sqrt{\delta}-1}{\delta}\right)^2$, and such that

$$\sum_{i=j}^{\infty}\left(6\zeta_{n_i}(V)\gamma_{n_i,k_i}+t_{i,n_i,k_i}(\delta,V)\mathrm{e}^{Z_{n_i}(V)}\eta_{n_i,k_i}\right)\delta^{i+2}\leq\frac{1}{256}. \tag{2.4}$$

By **(A)**, we see that for any $r>0$ and $\{(n_i,k_i)\}\in I_\delta$, the set $D(r,\{(n_i,k_i)\})$ is non-empty.

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that* (2.1) *holds.*

1. *If* **(A)** *is satisfied, then the super Poincaré inequality*

$$\mu_V(f^2)\leq r\mathscr{E}_V(f)+\beta_V(r)\mu_V(|f|)^2,\quad r>0,\quad f\in\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V) \tag{2.5}$$

holds with

$$\beta_V(r):=\inf\left\{2\delta^j:\ \{(n_i,k_i)\}\in I_\delta,\ j\in D(r,\{(n_i,k_i)\})\right\}<\infty,\quad r>0.$$

2. *If* (A2) *is satisfied and* (A1) *is replaced by the following weaker assumption*

(A1′) $\limsup_{i\to\infty}(\varepsilon_{n_i,k_i}(V)+t_{i,n_i,k_i}(\delta,V))<\infty$,
then the defective Poincaré inequality (2.2) *holds for some* $C_1,C_2>0$.

The following example shows that Theorem 2.2 is sharp in some specific situations.

Example 2.3. Let $E = \mathbb{R}^m$ with $d(x,y) = |x-y|$, and let

$$q(x,y) = \frac{(1+|y|)^{m+\alpha}\log(1+|y|)}{|x-y|^{m+\alpha}}, \quad \mu(\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{c_{m,\alpha}\mathrm{d}x}{(1+|x|)^{m+\alpha}\log(1+|x|)},$$

where $\alpha \in (0,2)$ and $c_{m,\alpha} > 0$ is the normalizing constant such that μ is a probability measure. It is easy to see that all the assumptions in the introduction for $(\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}))$ are satisfied. We consider V satisfying

$$-s\varepsilon\log\log(e+|x|) - K \le V(x) \le (1-s)\varepsilon\log\log(e+|x|) + K, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m \tag{2.6}$$

for some constants $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, $s \in [0,1]$ and $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu(\mathrm{e}^V) = 1$.

(1) If $\varepsilon < 1$ then (2.5) holds with

$$\beta_V(r) = \exp\big(C_1(1 + r^{-1/(1-\varepsilon)})\big), \tag{2.7}$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$.

(2) β_V in (1) can not be replaced by any essentially smaller functions, i.e. when $V(x) = \varepsilon\log\log(\mathrm{e}+|x|) + K_0$ for some constant $K_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu(\mathrm{e}^V) = 1$, the estimate (2.7) is sharp in the sense that the super Poincaré inequality (2.5) does not hold if

$$\lim_{r\to 0} r^{1/(1-\varepsilon)}\log\beta_V(r) = 0.$$

(3) In (1) the constant K can not be replaced by any unbounded positive function, i.e. for any increasing function $\phi : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ with $\phi(r) \uparrow \infty$ as $r \uparrow \infty$, there exists V such that

$$\varepsilon\log\log(\mathrm{e}+|x|) \le V(x) \le \varepsilon\log\log(\mathrm{e}+|x|) + \phi(|x|) \tag{2.8}$$

with $\mu(\mathrm{e}^V) < \infty$, but the super Poincaré inequality (2.5) with β_V given by (2.7) does not hold for $\mu_V(\mathrm{d}x) := \frac{\mathrm{e}^{V(x)}\mathrm{d}x}{\mu(\mathrm{e}^V)}$.

(4) If $\varepsilon = 1$, then $(\mathscr{E}_V, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V))$ satisfies the Poincaré inequality

$$\mu_V(f^2) \le C\mathscr{E}_V(f,f) + \mu_V(f)^2, \quad f \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V) \tag{2.9}$$

with some constant $C > 0$.

Proof. As (2) is included in [15, Corollary 1.3], we only prove (1), (3) and (4).

(a) According to [15, Corollary 1.3(3)], we know the logarithmic Sobolev inequality holds for $(\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}))$, i.e. the super Poincaré inequality (2.1) holds for $(\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}))$ with the rate function $\beta(r) = \exp\big(c_1(1 + r^{-1})\big)$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$.

Next, by (2.6), there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that for n large enough

$$\begin{aligned} &K_{n,n}(V) \le \varepsilon \log\log n + c_2, \quad J_{n,n}(V) \le (1+s)\varepsilon \log\log n + c_2, \\ &Z_n(V) \le (1-s)\varepsilon \log\log n + c_2, \quad \zeta_n(V) \le \frac{c_2}{\log^{1-(1-s)\varepsilon} n}, \quad \varepsilon_{n,n}(V) \le \frac{c_2}{\log^{1-\varepsilon} n}, \\ &\gamma_{n,n} \le \frac{c_2}{n^\alpha}, \quad \eta_{n,n} \le \frac{c_2}{n^\alpha \log(1+n)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

For any $\delta > 1$, taking $\{n_i\} = \{\delta^i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, and $k_i = n_i$, we get that $t_{i,n_i,k_i}(\delta, V) \le c_3 i^{-1}$ for i large enough and some constant $c_3 > 0$. So, assumption **(A)** is fulfilled.

Moreover, by (2.3) and (2.4), it is easy to check that for $r > 0$ small enough we have

$$\left\{ j \ge 1 : j \ge c_4 r^{-\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}} \right\} \subseteq D(r, \{(n_i, k_i)\}).$$

Then, the assertion in (1) follows from Theorem 2.2(1) and (2.10).

(b) Let $\psi(r) = (1 + \log(1+r)) \wedge \mathrm{e}^{\phi(r)}$ for $r \ge 0$. Then $1 \le \psi \le \mathrm{e}^\phi$, $\psi(r) \uparrow \infty$ as $r \uparrow \infty$ and $\psi(r) \le 2\log r$ for large r. Let

$$V(x) = \varepsilon \log\log(\mathrm{e} + |x|) + \log \psi(|x|).$$

Then V satisfies (2.8) and $\mu(\mathrm{e}^V) < \infty$. Up to a normalization constant we may simply assume that $\mu_V(\mathrm{d}x) = \mathrm{e}^{V(x)}\mathrm{d}x$.

Now, suppose that (2.5) holds with β_V given by (2.7). For any $n \ge 1$, let $f_n \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy that

$$f_n(x) \begin{cases} = 0, & |x| \le n, \\ \in [0,1], & n \le |x| \le 2n, \\ = 1, & |x| \ge 2n, \end{cases}$$

and $|\nabla f_n| \le \frac{2}{n}$. Then, there exists a constant $c_5 > 0$ independent of n such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(f_n, f_n)(x) &= c_{m,\alpha} \int \frac{(f_n(y) - f_n(x))^2}{|y-x|^{m+\alpha}} \,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\le \frac{4c_{m,\alpha}}{n^2} \int_{\{|y-x| \le n\}} \frac{\mathrm{d}y}{|y-x|^{m+\alpha-2}} + c_{m,\alpha} \int_{\{|y-x|>n\}} \frac{\mathrm{d}y}{|y-x|^{m+\alpha}} \\ &\le \frac{c_5}{n^\alpha}, \quad n \ge 1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

According to the definition of f_n and the increasing property of ψ, there exists $c_6 > 0$ such that

$$\mu_V(f_n^2) \ge \frac{c_6 \psi(n)}{n^\alpha \log^{1-\varepsilon} n}, \quad n \ge 2. \tag{2.12}$$

On the other hand, since $\psi(r) \le 2\log r$ for large r, we have

$$\mu_V(|\cdot| > n) \le c_7 \int_n^\infty \frac{\psi(r)\mathrm{d}r}{r^{1+\alpha} \log^{1-\varepsilon} r} \le \frac{c_8 \log^\varepsilon n}{n^\alpha}, \quad n \ge 2.$$

Then

$$\mu_V(f_n)^2 \le \mu_V(f_n^2)\mu_V(|\cdot| > n) \le \frac{c_8 \log^\varepsilon n}{n^\alpha}\mu_V(f_n^2), \quad n \ge 2.$$

Combining this with (2.5), (2.11) and (2.12), we obtain

$$1 - \frac{c_8 \log^\varepsilon n}{n^\alpha}\beta_V(r) \le \frac{c_5 r}{n^\alpha \mu_V(f_n^2)} \le \frac{c_9 r \log^{1-\varepsilon} n}{\psi(n)}, \quad r > 0, n \ge 2 \tag{2.13}$$

for some constant $c_9 > 0$. Since $\psi(n) \le 2\log n$ for large n, it is easy to see that

$$r_n := \beta_V^{-1}\Big(\frac{n^\alpha}{2c_8 \log^\varepsilon n}\Big) \le \frac{c_{10}}{\log^{1-\varepsilon} n}$$

holds for some constant $c_{10} > 0$ and large n. Therefore, it follows from (2.13) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \le \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{c_9 r_n \log^{1-\varepsilon} n}{\psi(n)} = 0,$$

which is a contradiction.

(c) If $\varepsilon = 1$ in (2.6), the estimate (2.10) is still true. According to Theorem 2.2(2), the defective Poincaré inequality (2.2) holds for $(\mathscr{E}_V, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V))$. On the other hand, by [15, Theorem 1.1(3)], the weak Poincaré inequality holds for $(\mathscr{E}_V, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V))$. Therefore, the required Poincaré inequality follows from [11, Proposition 1.3] or [14, Proposition 4.1.2]. □

Finally, we consider an example for finite range of jumps to illustrate Theorem 2.1.

Example 2.4. Let $E = \mathbb{R}^m$ with $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ and let

$$q(x, y) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{|y|^\kappa}}{|x - y|^{m+\alpha}} 1_{\{|x-y|\le 1\}}, \quad \mu(\mathrm{d}x) = c_{m,\kappa}\mathrm{e}^{-|x|^\kappa}\mathrm{d}x$$

for some constants $0 < \alpha < 2$, $\kappa > 1$ and $c_{m,\kappa} \ge 1$ such that μ is a probability measure. It is easy to see that all the assumptions in the introduction for $(\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}))$ is satisfied. Consider V satisfying

$$-C_1(1 + |x|^{\theta-1}) - K \le V(x) \le C_1(1 + |x|^{\theta-1}) + K, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m \tag{2.14}$$

for some constants $\theta \in (1, \kappa]$, $C_1 > 0$ and $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu(\mathrm{e}^V) = 1$.

(1) If $\theta < \kappa$, then the super Poincaré inequality holds for $(\mathscr{E}_V, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V))$ with

$$\beta_V(r) = C_2 \exp\Big[C_2 \log^{\frac{\kappa}{\kappa-1}}(1 + r^{-1})\Big]$$

for some positive constants $C_2 > 0$.

(2) Let $\theta = \kappa$. Then if $C_1 > 0$ is small enough, then the Poincaré inequality (2.9) holds for some constants $C > 0$.

Proof. According to [5, Example 1.2(2)], we know the super Poincaré inequality (2.1) holds for $(\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}))$ with

$$\beta(r) = c_1 \exp\Big[c_1 \log^{\frac{\kappa}{\kappa-1}}(1+r^{-1})\Big] \tag{2.15}$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$.

(1) By (2.14) and the fact that $\theta < \kappa$, one can find some constants $c_2, c_3 > 0$ such that for n large enough

$$K_{n,n}(V) \le c_2 n^{\theta-1}, \quad J_{n,n}(V) \le c_2 n^{\theta-1}, \quad \varepsilon_{n,n}(V) \le \mathrm{e}^{-c_3 n^{\kappa-1}}.$$

Therefore, for every r small enough, taking

$$n = c_4 \log^{\frac{1}{\kappa-1}}(1+r^{-1})$$

and

$$s = \exp\big(-c_5 \log(1+r^{-1})\big)$$

for some constants $c_5 >> c_4 >> 1$, we obtain

$$8\varepsilon_{n,n}(V) + s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,n}(V)} \le \frac{r}{2(1+8\lambda r)}.$$

The first required assertion for super Poincaré inequality of $(\mathscr{E}_V, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V))$ follows from Theorem 2.1(1) and all the estimates above.

(2) Let $\theta = \kappa$. By (2.14), (2.15) and the definition of μ, for n large enough we have

$$K_{n,n}(V) \le 3C_1 n^{\kappa-1}, \quad \beta^{-1}(\mu(|x| > n-1)^{-1}) \le \mathrm{e}^{-c_6 n^{\kappa-1}},$$

for some constant $c_6 > 0$ depending only on β and μ. So, if $C_1 < c_6/3$, then $\inf_{n\ge1} \varepsilon_{n,n}(V) < \infty$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.1(2), the defective Poincaré inequality holds for $(\mathscr{E}_V, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V))$. Finally, according to [5, Proposition 2.6], the weak Poincaré inequality holds for $(\mathscr{E}_V, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V))$. Therefore, the Poincaré inequality holds for $(\mathscr{E}_V, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V))$. □

To show that in Example 2.4(2) it is essential to assume that $C_1 > 0$ is small, we present below a counterexample inspired by [2, Proposition 5.1].

Proposition 2.5. *In the situation of Example* 2.4, *let* $\theta = \kappa, \alpha \in (0,1)$ *and* $m = 1$. *Let*

$$V(x) = K_0 + L\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1_{[nH,(n+1)H)}(x)(n+1)^{\kappa-1}\Big(2n+1-\frac{2x}{H}\Big),$$

where $H > 4, L > \frac{\kappa H^\kappa}{H-2}$ *and* $K_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ *are constants such that* $\mu(\mathrm{e}^V) = 1$. *Then* (2.14) *holds for some constant* $C_1 > 0$ *and* $K \in \mathbb{R}$; *however, for any* $C > 0$, *the Poincaré inequality* (2.9) *does not hold.*

Proof. It suffices to disprove the Poincaré inequality, for which we are going to construct a sequences of functions $\{f_n\} \subset \mathscr{A}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathscr{E}_V(f_n)}{\mathrm{Var}_{\mu_V}(f_n)} = 0.$$

For $n \geq 1$, let

$$f_n(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\int_{Hn+1}^{x} \exp(y^\kappa - V(y))\mathrm{d}y}{\int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1} \exp(y^\kappa - V(y))\mathrm{d}y}, & x \in (Hn+1, H(n+1)-1), \\ 1, & x \in [H(n+1)-1, +\infty), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

which is a bounded Lipschitz continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$, so that $f_n \in \mathscr{A}$. In the following calculations C stands for a constant which varies from line to line but is independent of n (may depend on H or L). We simply denote $K_n = L(n+1)^{\kappa-1}$ for $n \geq 1$, so that

$$V(x) = K_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1_{[nH,(n+1)H)}(x) K_n\Big(2n+1-\frac{2x}{H}\Big).$$

(a) Estimate on $\mathrm{Var}_{\mu_V}(f_n)$. For n large enough, since $z \mapsto \big(z^\kappa - K_{n+1}(2n+3-\frac{2z}{H})\big)$ is increasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_V(f_n^2) &\geq \mu_V\big(H(n+1) \leq x \leq H(n+2)\big) \\ &\geq C\int_{H(n+1)}^{H(n+2)} \frac{\exp\big(K_{n+1}(2n+3-\frac{2z}{H}) - z^\kappa\big)}{\kappa z^{\kappa-1} + \frac{2K_{n+1}}{H}} \mathrm{d}\Big(z^\kappa - K_{n+1}(2n+3-\frac{2z}{H})\Big) \\ &\geq \frac{C\big\{\exp\big(-(H(n+1))^\kappa + K_{n+1}\big) - \exp\big(-(H(n+2))^\kappa - K_{n+1}\big)\big\}}{(n+2)^{\kappa-1}} \\ &\geq \frac{C\exp\big(-(H(n+1))^\kappa + K_{n+1}\big)}{(n+2)^{\kappa-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that for n large enough,

$$\mu_V(f_n)^2 = \mu_V(f_n 1_{\{x\geq n\}})^2 \leq \mu_V(f_n^2)\mu_V(x \geq n) \leq \frac{\mu_V(f_n^2)}{2},$$

we arrive at

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\mu_V}(f_n) \geq \frac{C\exp\big(-(H(n+1))^\kappa + K_{n+1}\big)}{(n+2)^{\kappa-1}}. \tag{2.16}$$

(b) Estimate on $\mathscr{E}_V(f_n)$. Let

$$g_n(x) = \Big(\int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1} \exp\big(y^\kappa - V(y)\big)\mathrm{d}y\Big) f_n(x).$$

Noting that $g_n'(x) \neq 0$ only when $x \in (Hn+1, H(n+1)-1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{E}_V(g_n) &\le C \int_{Hn}^{H(n+1)} \Big(\int_{\{|x-y|\le 1\}} \frac{|\int_x^y g_n'(z)\mathrm{d}z|^2}{|x-y|^{1+\alpha}} \mathrm{d}y \Big) \exp\big(-x^\kappa + V(x)\big)\mathrm{d}x \\
&= C \int_{Hn}^{H(n+1)} \Big(\int_{\{|x-y|\le 1, x\le y\}} \frac{|\int_x^y g_n'(z)\mathrm{d}z|^2}{|x-y|^{1+\alpha}} \mathrm{d}y \Big) \exp\big(-x^\kappa + V(x)\big)\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + C \int_{Hn}^{H(n+1)} \Big(\int_{\{|x-y|\le 1, x> y\}} \frac{|\int_x^y g_n'(z)\mathrm{d}z|^2}{|x-y|^{1+\alpha}} \mathrm{d}y \Big) \exp\big(-x^\kappa + V(x)\big)\mathrm{d}x \\
&=: C(I_1 + I_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $g_n'(x) = \exp\big(x^\kappa - V(x)\big)$ for $x \in (Hn+1, H(n+1)-1)$, and since for large n the function $z \mapsto z^\kappa - V(z)$ is increasing on $(Hn, H(n+1))$, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have, for $x \in (Hn, H(n+1)-1)$ and $x \le y \le x+1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{|\int_x^y g_n'(z)\mathrm{d}z|^2}{|x-y|^{1+\alpha}} \\
&= \frac{|\int_{x\vee(Hn+1)}^{y\wedge(H(n+1)-1)} g_n'(z)\mathrm{d}z|^2}{|x-y|^{1+\alpha}} \\
&\le \frac{|\int_{x\vee(Hn+1)}^{y\wedge(H(n+1)-1)} \exp\big(z^\kappa - V(z)\big)\mathrm{d}z|}{|x-y|^{1+\alpha}} \int_{x\vee(Hn+1)}^{y\wedge(H(n+1)-1)} |g_n'|^2(z)\mathrm{e}^{-z^\kappa + V(z)}\mathrm{d}z \\
&\le \frac{\exp\big((x+1)^\kappa - V(x+1)\big)}{|x-y|^\alpha} \Big(\int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1} |g_n'|^2(z)\mathrm{e}^{-z^\kappa+V(z)}\mathrm{d}z \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, since $\alpha \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\le C \Big(\int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1} |g_n'|^2(z) \exp\big(-z^\kappa + V(z)\big)\mathrm{d}z \Big) \\
&\qquad \times \Big[\int_{Hn}^{H(n+1)-1} \Big(\int_{\{|x-y|\le 1\}} \frac{1}{|x-y|^\alpha}\mathrm{d}y \Big) \exp\Big((x+1)^\kappa - x^\kappa - V(x+1) + V(x)\Big)\mathrm{d}x \Big] \\
&\le C \Big(\int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1} \exp\big(z^\kappa - V(z)\big)\mathrm{d}z \Big) \exp\Big(\kappa(H(n+1))^{\kappa-1} + \frac{2K_n}{H} \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$I_2 \le C \int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1} \exp\big(z^\kappa - V(z)\big)\mathrm{d}z.$$

So, for n large enough,

$$\mathscr{E}_V(g_n) \le C \Big(\int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1} \exp\big(z^\kappa - V(z)\big)\mathrm{d}z \Big) \exp\Big(\kappa(H(n+1))^{\kappa-1} + \frac{2K_n}{H} \Big).$$

Moreover, for large n,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1} \exp\big(z^\kappa - V(z)\big)\,\mathrm{d}z\\
&= \int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1} \frac{\exp\big(z^\kappa - \frac{2K_n(Hn-z)}{H} - K_n\big)}{\kappa z^{\kappa-1} + \frac{2K_n}{H}}\mathrm{d}\Big(z^\kappa - \frac{2K_n(Hn-z)}{H} - K_n\Big)\\
&\geq \frac{C\exp\big((H(n+1)-1)^\kappa + \frac{(H-2)K_n}{H}\big) - \exp\big((Hn+1)^\kappa - \frac{(H-2)K_n}{H}\big)}{(n+1)^{\kappa-1}}\\
&\geq \frac{C\exp\big((H(n+1)-1)^\kappa + \frac{(H-2)K_n}{H}\big)}{(n+1)^{\kappa-1}},
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for large n,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{E}_V(f_n) &= \frac{\mathscr{E}_V(g_n)}{(\int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1}\exp\big(z^\kappa - V(z)\big)\mathrm{d}z)^2}\\
&\leq \frac{C\exp\big(\kappa(H(n+1))^{\kappa-1} + \frac{2K_n}{H}\big)}{\int_{Hn+1}^{H(n+1)-1}\exp\big(z^\kappa - V(z)\big)\mathrm{d}z}\\
&\leq C(n+1)^{\kappa-1}\exp\Big(\kappa(H(n+1))^{\kappa-1} - (H(n+1)-1)^\kappa - \frac{(H-4)K_n}{H}\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

(c) Combining (2.16) with (2.17) and noting that

$$(H(n+1))^\kappa - (H(n+1)-1)^\kappa \leq \kappa(H(n+1))^{\kappa-1},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\mathscr{E}_V(f_n,f_n)}{\mathrm{Var}_{\mu_V}(f_n)}\\
&\leq C\lim_{n\to\infty}(n+2)^{2(\kappa-1)}\exp\Big(2\kappa(H(n+1))^{\kappa-1} - \frac{2(H-2)}{H}K_n\Big) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

since

$$L > \frac{\kappa H^\kappa}{H-2}.$$

$\square$

2.2 Proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2

As in [2, Theorem 3.1], we shall adopt a split argument by estimating $\mu(f^2 1_{\{\rho\geq n\}})$ and $\mu(f^2 1_{\{\rho\leq n\}})$ respectively. Unlike in the local setting where the chain rule is available, in the present situation the uniform norm $\|f\|_\infty$ will appear in our estimates when the range of jumps is infinite. Below we simply denote $K_{n,k} = K_{n,k}(V), J_{n,k} = J_{n,k}(V), Z_n = Z_n(V), \varepsilon_{n,k} = \varepsilon_{n,k}(V), \zeta_n = \zeta_n(V)$ and $t_{i,n,k} = t_{i,n,k}(\delta, V)$.

Lemma 2.6. *For any $n \geq 1$, $k \geq 1$ and $f \in \mathscr{A}$,*

$$\mu_V(f^2 1_{\{\rho \geq n\}}) \leq 12\varepsilon_{n,k}\mathscr{E}_V(f) + 128\lambda\varepsilon_{n,k}\mu_V(f^2) + 96\zeta_n\gamma_{n,k}\|f\|_\infty^2.$$

Proof. If $f|_{\{\rho \leq n-1\}} = 0$, by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we have

$$\mu(|f|)^2 = \mu\big(|f|1_{\{\rho > n-1\}}\big)^2 \leq \mu(\rho > n-1)\mu(f^2).$$

Substituting this into (2.1) with $r = \beta^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{2\mu(\rho > n-1)}\big)$ we obtain

$$\mu(f^2) \leq 2\beta^{-1}\big(1/[2\mu(\rho > n-1)]\big)\mathscr{E}(f), \quad f \in \mathscr{A},\ f|_{\{\rho \leq n-1\}} = 0. \tag{2.18}$$

To apply (2.18) for general $f \in \mathscr{A}$, we consider fl_n instead of f, where $l_n := h_n \circ \rho$ for some function $h_n \in C^\infty([0,\infty);[0,\infty))$ satisfying

$$h_n(s) \begin{cases} = 1, & n \leq s \leq n+1, \\ \in [0,1], & n-1 \leq s < n \quad \text{or} \quad n+1 < s \leq n+2, \\ = 0, & s < n-1 \quad \text{or} \quad s > n+2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sup_{s \in [0,\infty)} |h_n'(s)| \leq 2.$$

It is easy to see that

$$|l_n(x) - l_n(y)| \leq 2(1 \wedge d(x,y))\big\{1_{\{\rho(x) \in (n-2,n+3)\}} + 1_{\{\rho(y) \in (n-1,n+2), \rho(x) \notin (n-2,n+3)\}}\big\}.$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\Gamma(fl_n)(x) \\ &\leq 2\int_E \big\{l_n(y)^2(f(x)-f(y))^2 + f(x)^2(l_n(x)-l_n(y))^2\big\}q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y) \\ &\leq 2\int_{\{\rho(y) \in (n-1,n+2)\}} (f(x)-f(y))^2 q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y) + 8\lambda f(x)^2 1_{\{\rho(x) \in (n-2,n+3)\}} \\ &\quad + 8f^2(x)1_{\{\rho(x) \notin (n-2,n+3)\}}\int_{\{\rho(y) \in (n-1,n+2)\}} q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y). \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

Since

$$1_{\{\rho(x) \notin (n-2,n+3)\}}\int_{\{\rho(y) \in (n-1,n+2)\}} q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y) \leq 1_{\{\rho(x) \notin (n-2,n+3)\}}\int_{\{d(x,y) > 1\}} q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y) \leq \lambda,$$

we have $\Gamma(fl_n) \in \mathscr{B}_b(E)$, and $fl_n \in \mathscr{A}$.

Let

$$\delta_{n,k} = \mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}}\beta^{-1}\big(1/[2\mu(\rho > n-1)]\big),\ \theta_n := \mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho \leq n+2} V}\beta^{-1}\big(1/[2\mu(\rho > n-1)]\big).$$

Combining (2.18) with (2.19), and noting that $\rho(y)\in(n-1,n+2)$ and $\rho(x)\ge n+k+2$ imply $d(x,y)>k$, and

$$\begin{aligned}&\iint_{\{\rho(x)>n+k+2,\rho(y)\in(n-1,n+2)\}}(f(x)-f(y))^2q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x)\\&\le 4\|f\|_\infty^2\iint_{\{\rho(x)>n+k+2,\rho(y)\in(n-1,n+2),d(x,y)>k\}}q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x),\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu_V(f^2l_n^2)\le \mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n+2}V}\mu(f^2l_n^2)\\&\le 2\mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n+2}V}\beta^{-1}\big(1/[2\mu(\rho>n-1)]\big)\mathscr{E}(fl_n)\\&\le 2\mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n+2}V}\beta^{-1}\big(1/[2\mu(\rho>n-1)]\big)\mu(1_{\{\rho\le n+k+2\}}\Gamma(fl_n))\\&\quad+2\mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n+2}V}\beta^{-1}\big(1/[2\mu(\rho>n-1)]\big)\mu(1_{\{\rho>n+k+2\}}\Gamma(fl_n))\\&\le 4\delta_{n,k}\iint_{\{\rho(x)\le n+k+2,\rho(y)\in(n-1,n+2)\}}(f(x)-f(y))^2q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu_V(\mathrm{d}x)\\&\quad+16\delta_{n,k}\lambda\mu_V\big(1_{\{\rho\in(n-2,n+3)\}}f^2\big)\\&\quad+16\delta_{n,k}\iint_{\{\rho(x)\le n+k+2,\rho(x)\notin(n-2,n+3),\rho(y)\in(n-1,n+2)\}}f(x)^2q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu_V(\mathrm{d}x)\\&\quad+32\theta_n\|f\|_\infty^2\iint_{\{\rho(y)\in(n-1,n+2),d(x,y)>k\}}q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x).\end{aligned}\tag{2.20}$$

Noting that $\varepsilon_{n,k}=\sup_{m\ge n}\delta_{m,k}$, $\zeta_n=\sup_{m\ge n}\theta_m$, $\sum_{m=1}^\infty 1_{\{\rho(y)\in(m-1,m+2)\}}\le 3$ and

$$1_{\{\rho(x)\le n+k+2,\rho(x)\notin(n-2,n+3),\rho(y)\in(n-1,n+2)\}}\le 1_{\{d(x,y)>1,\rho(y)\in(n-1,n+2)\}},$$

and taking summations in (2.20) from n, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu_V(f^21_{\{\rho\ge n\}})\le\sum_{m=n}^\infty\mu_V(f^2l_m^2)\\&\le 12\varepsilon_{n,k}\iint_{E\times E}(f(x)-f(y))^2q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu_V(\mathrm{d}x)+80\varepsilon_{n,k}\lambda\mu_V(f^2)\\&\quad+48\varepsilon_{n,k}\iint_{\{d(x,y)>1\}}f(x)^2q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu_V(\mathrm{d}x)\\&\quad+96\zeta_n\|f\|_\infty^2\iint_{\{\rho(y)\ge n-1,d(x,y)>k\}}q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x)\\&\le 12\varepsilon_{n,k}\mathscr{E}_V(f)+128\lambda\varepsilon_{n,k}\mu_V(f^2)+96\zeta_n\gamma_{n,k}\|f\|_\infty^2.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.7. *For any $n,k\ge 1$, $s>0$ and $f\in\mathscr{A}$,*

$$\mu_V(f^21_{\{\rho\le n\}})\le 2s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}}\mathscr{E}_V(f)+16\lambda s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}}\mu_V(f^2)+16s\mathrm{e}^{Z_n}\eta_{n,k}\|f\|_\infty^2+\beta(s)\mathrm{e}^{J_{n,k}}\mu_V(|f|)^2.$$

Proof. Let $\phi_n : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ be a smooth function such that

$$\phi_n(s) \begin{cases} = 1, & s \le n, \\ \in [0,1], & n \le s < n+1, \\ = 0, & s > n+1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sup_{s\in[0,\infty)} |\phi_n'(s)| \le 2.$$

Set $g_n = \phi_n \circ \rho$. Then $g_n \in \mathscr{A}$ and

$$|g_n(x) - g_n(y)| \le 2(1 \wedge d(x,y))\big(1_{\{\rho(x)\le n+1\}} + 1_{\{\rho(x)>n+1,\rho(y)\le n+1\}}\big).$$

So, similarly to (2.19) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(fg_n)(x) \le 2 &\int_{\{\rho(y)\le n+1\}} (f(x)-f(y))^2 q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y) \\ &+ 8\lambda f^2(x) 1_{\{\rho(x)\le n+k+2\}} + 8f^2(x)1_{\{\rho(x)>n+k+2\}} \int_{\{\rho(y)\le n+1\}} q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y).\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\rho(x) > n+k+2$ and $\rho(y) \le n+1$ imply that $d(x,y) > k$, and

$$\begin{aligned}&\iint_{\{\rho(x)>n+k+2,\rho(y)\le n+1\}} (f(x)-f(y))^2 q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &\le 4\|f\|_\infty^2 \iint_{\{\rho(x)>n+k+2,\rho(y)\le n+1,d(x,y)>k\}} q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x).\end{aligned}$$

Combining all the estimates above with (2.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu_V(f^2 1_{\{\rho\le n\}}) \\ &\le \mu_V(f^2 g_n^2) \le \mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n+1} V} \mu(f^2 g_n^2) \\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n+1} V} \Big\{ s\mu(\Gamma(fg_n)) + \beta(s)\mu(|fg_n|)^2 \Big\} \\ &= \mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n+1} V} \Big\{ s\mu(1_{\{\rho\le n+k+2\}}\Gamma(fg_n)) + s\mu(1_{\{\rho>n+k+2\}}\Gamma(fg_n)) + \beta(s)\mu(|fg_n|)^2 \Big\} \\ &\le s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}} \mu_V(1_{\{\rho\le n+k+2\}}\Gamma(fg_n)) + s\mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n+1} V} \mu(1_{\{\rho>n+k+2\}}\Gamma(fg_n)) + \beta(s)\mathrm{e}^{J_{n,k}}\mu_V(|f|)^2 \\ &\le 2s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}} \mathscr{E}_V(f) + 16\lambda s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}}\mu_V(f^2) + 16s\mathrm{e}^{Z_n}\eta_{n,k}\|f\|_\infty^2 + \beta(s)\mathrm{e}^{J_{n,k}}\mu_V(|f|)^2.\end{aligned}$$

□

Now, we are in a position to prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. It suffices to prove for $f \in \mathscr{A}$.

(1) Since $q(x,y)=0$ for $d(x,y)>k_0$, we have $\gamma_{n,k}=\eta_{n,k}=0$ for all $k\ge k_0$ So, by Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_V(f^2)\le & 2\big(6\varepsilon_{n,k}+s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}}\big)\mathscr{E}_V(f)+16\lambda\big(8\varepsilon_{n,k}+s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}}\big)\mu_V(f^2)\\ &+\beta(s)\mathrm{e}^{J_{n,k}}\mu_V(|f|)^2,\quad s>0,n\ge1,k\ge k_0.\end{aligned}\tag{2.21}$$

If $\inf_{n\ge1,k\ge k_0}\varepsilon_{n,k}=0$, then for any $r'\in(0,r]$ there exist $s>0$, $n\ge1$ and $k\ge k_0$ such that

$$8\varepsilon_{n,k}+s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}}\le\frac{r'}{2+16\lambda r'}.$$

Combining this with (2.21) we obtain

$$\mu_V(f^2)\le r'\mathscr{E}_V(f)+(1+8\lambda r')\beta(s)\mathrm{e}^{J_{n,k}}\mu_V(|f|)^2\le r\mathscr{E}_V(f)+(1+8\lambda r')\beta(s)\mathrm{e}^{J_{n,k}}\mu_V(|f|)^2.$$

This implies the super Poincaré inequality for the desired β_V.

(2) If

$$\inf_{n\ge1,k\ge k_0}\varepsilon_{n,k}<\frac{1}{128\lambda},\tag{2.22}$$

then there exist $n\ge1$, $k\ge k_0$ and $s>0$ such that

$$16\lambda\big(8\varepsilon_{n,k}+s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}}\big)<1.$$

Therefore, the defective Poincaré inequality follows from (2.21).

To prove (2.2) without condition (2.22), we follow the approach in the proof of [2, Theorem 3.1(2)] by making bounded perturbations of V. For any $N\ge1$, write

$$V=V_N+(V\wedge N)\vee(-N),\quad V_N:=(V-N)1_{\{V\ge N\}}+(V+N)1_{\{V\le -N\}}.$$

Since $(V\wedge N)\vee(-N)$ is bounded and the defective Poincaré inequality is stable under bounded perturbations of V, we only need to prove that when V is unbounded we may find $N\ge1$ such that the defective Poincaré inequality holds for V_N in place of V. It is easy to check that for n large enough

$$\sup_{\rho\le n}V_N\le\begin{cases}\big(\sup_{\rho\le n}V\big)-N, & \text{if } \sup_E V=+\infty,\\ \sup_{\rho\le n}V, & \text{if } \sup_E V<+\infty,\end{cases}$$

and

$$\inf_{\rho\le n}V_N\ge\begin{cases}\big(\inf_{\rho\le n}V\big)+N, & \text{if } \inf_E V=-\infty,\\ \inf_{\rho\le n}V, & \text{if } \inf_E V>-\infty.\end{cases}$$

Thus, for large n we have $K_{n,k}(V_N)\le K_{n,k}(V)-N$, so that

$$\inf_{n\ge1,k\ge k_0}\varepsilon_{n,k}(V_N)\le\mathrm{e}^{-N}\inf_{n\ge1,k\ge k_0}\varepsilon_{n,k}(V).\tag{2.23}$$

Since $\inf_{n\ge1,k\ge k_0}\varepsilon_{n,k}(V)<\infty$, we see that (2.22) holds for V_N in place of V when N is large enough. Therefore, the defective Poincaré inequality holds for V_N in place of V as observed above. □

Next, we turn to the proof of Theorem 2.2. To get rid of the uniform norm included in Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7, we adopt a cut-off argument as in the proof of [12, Theorem 3.2] or [14, Theorem 3.3.3]. More precisely, for $\delta > 1$ in assumption **(A)** and a non-negative function f, let

$$f_{\delta,i} = (f - \delta^{\frac{i}{2}})^+ \wedge (\delta^{\frac{i+1}{2}} - \delta^{\frac{i}{2}}), \quad i \geq 0. \tag{2.24}$$

According to [14, Lemma 3.3.2], for $f \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V)$ and $i, j \geq 0$, we have $f_{\delta,i}$, $(f - \delta^{\frac{j}{2}})^+$ and $f \wedge \delta^{\frac{j}{2}} \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V)$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \mathscr{E}_V(f_{\delta,i}) \leq \mathscr{E}_V((f - \delta^{\frac{j}{2}})^+), \quad \mathscr{E}_V((f - \delta^{\frac{j}{2}})^+) + \mathscr{E}_V(f \wedge \delta^{\frac{j}{2}}) \leq \mathscr{E}_V(f). \tag{2.25}$$

We also have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.8. *For any non-negative function f and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ := \{0, 1, 2, \cdots\}$,*

$$\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} f_{\delta,i}^2 \geq c(\delta)\big((f - \delta^{\frac{k}{2}})^+\big)^2. \tag{2.26}$$

Proof. We shall simply use f to denote its value at a fixed point. If $f \leq 1$, then both sides in (2.26) are equal to zero. Assume that $f \in (\delta^{\frac{l}{2}}, \delta^{\frac{l+1}{2}}]$ for some $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. If $l \leq k$ then

$$\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} f_{\delta,i}^2 = \big((f - \delta^{\frac{k}{2}})^+\big)^2 \geq c(\delta)\big((f - \delta^{\frac{k}{2}})^+\big)^2.$$

Next, if $l > k$ then

$$\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} f_{\delta,i}^2 \geq (\delta^{\frac{l}{2}} - \delta^{\frac{l-1}{2}})^2 = c(\delta)\delta^{l+1} \geq c(\delta) f^2.$$

In conclusion, (2.26) holds. □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Since $\mathscr{E}_V(|f|, |f|) \leq \mathscr{E}_V(f, f)$ for every $f \in \mathscr{A}$, without loss of generality, we may and do assume that $f \in \mathscr{A}$ with $f \geq 0$ and $\mu_V(f^2) = 1$.

(1) By Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_V(f^2) \leq & 2\big(6\varepsilon_{n,k} + s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}}\big)\mathscr{E}_V(f) + 16\lambda\big(8\varepsilon_{n,k} + s\mathrm{e}^{K_{n,k}}\big)\mu_V(f^2) \\ & + \beta(s)\mathrm{e}^{J_{n,k}}\mu_V(|f|)^2 + 16\big(6\zeta_n\gamma_{n,k} + s\mathrm{e}^{Z_n}\eta_{n,k}\big)\|f\|_\infty^2, \quad s, k \geq 1, n \geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

Next, let $r > 0$, $\{(n_i, k_i)\} \in I_\delta$, $j \in D(r, \{(n_i, k_i)\})$ be fixed, and let $f_{\delta,i}$ be defined by (2.24). Since $\|f_{\delta,i}\|_\infty^2 \leq c(\delta)\delta^{i+2}$ and by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\mu_V(f_{\delta,i})^2 = \mu_V(f_{\delta,i}1_{\{f \geq \delta^{i/2}\}})^2 \leq \mu_V(f_{\delta,i}^2)\mu_V(f^2 \geq \delta^i) \leq \mu_V(f_{\delta,i}^2)\delta^{-i},$$

it follows from (2.3) and (2.27) with $n = n_i$ and $s = t_{i,n_i,k_i}$ that

$$\mu_V(f_{\delta,i}^2) \le \frac{c(\delta)r}{8}\mathscr{E}_V(f_{\delta,i}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_V(f_{\delta,i}^2) + 16c(\delta)(6\zeta_{n_i}\gamma_{n_i,k_i} + t_{i,n_i,k_i}\mathrm{e}^{Z_{n_i}}\eta_{n_i,k_i})\delta^{i+2}, \quad i \ge j.$$

That is,

$$\mu_V(f_{\delta,i}^2) \le \frac{c(\delta)r}{4}\mathscr{E}_V(f_{\delta,i}) + 32c(\delta)(6\zeta_{n_i,k_i}\gamma_{n_i,k_i} + t_{i,n_i,k_i}\mathrm{e}^{Z_{n_i}}\eta_{n_i,k_i})\delta^{i+2}, \quad i \ge j.$$

Taking summation over $i \ge j$ and using (2.25), (2.26) and (2.4), we obtain

$$\mu_V\big({(f-\delta^{\frac{j}{2}})^{+}}^2\big) \le \frac{r}{4}\mathscr{E}_V((f-\delta^{\frac{j}{2}})^{+}) + \frac{1}{8}. \tag{2.28}$$

On the other hand, noting that $c(\delta) \in (0,1)$ and $\delta > 1$, applying (2.27) with $n = n_j$ and $s = t_{j,n_j,k_j}$ to $f \wedge \delta^{\frac{j}{2}}$, and combining with (2.3), (2.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_V(f^2 \wedge \delta^j) &\le \frac{c(\delta)r}{8}\mathscr{E}_V(f \wedge \delta^{\frac{j}{2}}) + \frac{1}{4}\mu_V(f^2 \wedge \delta^j) + \frac{\delta^j}{4}\mu_V(|f|)^2 \\ &\quad + 16(6\varepsilon_{n_j,k_j}\gamma_{n_j,k_j} + t_{j,n_j,k_j}\mathrm{e}^{Z_{n_j}}\eta_{n_j,k_j})\delta^j \\ &\le \frac{r}{8}\mathscr{E}_V(f \wedge \delta^{\frac{j}{2}}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_V(f^2 \wedge \delta^j) + \frac{\delta^j}{4}\mu_V(|f|)^2 + \frac{1}{16}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mu_V(f^2 \wedge \delta^j) \le \frac{r}{4}\mathscr{E}_V(f \wedge \delta^{\frac{j}{2}}) + \frac{\delta^j}{2}\mu_V(|f|)^2 + \frac{1}{8}.$$

Combining this with (2.28) and using (2.25), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}1 = \mu_V(f^2) &\le \mu_V\big\{((f-\delta^{\frac{j}{2}})^{+} + (f \wedge \delta^{\frac{j}{2}}))^2\big\} \\ &\le 2\mu_V\Big(\big((f-\delta^{\frac{j}{2}})^{+}\big)^2\Big) + 2\mu_V(f^2 \wedge \delta^j) \\ &\le \frac{r}{2}\Big(\mathscr{E}_V((f-\delta^{\frac{j}{2}})^{+}) + \mathscr{E}_V(f \wedge \delta^{\frac{j}{2}})\Big) + \frac{1}{2} + \delta^j\mu_V(|f|)^2 \\ &\le \frac{r}{2}\mathscr{E}_V(f) + \frac{1}{2} + \delta^j\mu_V(|f|)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mu_V(f^2) \le r\mathscr{E}_V(f) + 2\delta^j\mu_V(|f|)^2 \tag{2.29}$$

holds for all $\{(n_i,k_i)\} \in I_\delta$ and $j \in D(r,\{(n_i,k_i)\})$. This proves (2.5) for the desired β_V.

(2) If

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty}(8\varepsilon_{n_i,k_i} + t_{i,n_i,k_i}e^{K_{n_i,k_i}}) \le \frac{1}{64\lambda}, \tag{2.30}$$

then there exist a constant $r > 0$ and $j \geq 1$ such that (2.3) and (2.4) hold, i.e. $j \in D(r, \{(n_i, k_i)\})$. So, the arguments in (1) ensure (2.29), and so the defective Poincaré inequality for $C_1 = r$ and $C_2 = 2\delta^j$. Let V_N be in the proof of Theorem 2.1(2). It follows from the proof of Theorem 2.1(2) that for n large enough $K_{n,k}(V_N) \leq K_{n,k}(V) - N$. Since $J_{n,k}(V_N) \leq J_{n,k}(V)$ and $\beta(r)$ is decreasing, we have

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty} t_{i,n_i,k_i}(\delta, V_N) e^{K_{n_i,k_i}(V_N)} \leq \mathrm{e}^{-N} \limsup_{i\to\infty} t_{i,n_i,k_i}(\delta, V) e^{K_{n_i,k_i}(V)},$$

which combined with (2.23) yields that

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty} \Big(\varepsilon_{n_i,k_i}(V_N) + t_{i,n_i,k_i}(\delta, V_N) e^{K_{n_i,k_i}(V_N)}\Big) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-N} \limsup_{i\to\infty} \Big(\varepsilon_{n_i,k_i}(V) + t_{i,n_i,k_i}(\delta, V) e^{K_{n_i,k_i}(V)}\Big).$$

Then the remainder of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.1(2) by using (2.30) instead of (2.22). □

2.3 Perturbations for the super Poincaré inequality under a variation condition

It is well known that in the diffusion case the super Poincaré inequality is stable under Lipschitz perturbations (see [12, Proposition 2.6]). The aim of this section is to extend this result to the non-local setting using a variation condition on $\operatorname{supp} q := \{(x, y) : q(x, y) > 0\}$.

Theorem 2.9. *Assume that* (2.1) *holds. If there exists a constant* $\kappa_1 > 0$ *such that* $\kappa_2 := \mu(\mathrm{e}^{-2V}) < \infty$ *and*

$$|V(x) - V(y)| \leq \kappa_1 (1 \wedge d(x, y)), \quad (x, y) \in \operatorname{supp} q. \tag{2.31}$$

Then (2.5) *holds for*

$$\beta_V(s) := \inf\Big\{16\kappa_2 \beta(r)^3 (4 + \lambda\kappa_1^2 s') : \ s' \in (0, s], 0 < r \leq \frac{s' \mathrm{e}^{-\kappa_1}}{4 + \lambda\kappa_1^2 s'}\Big\}, \quad s > 0.$$

Proof. To prove (2.1) for the desired β_V, we may and do assume that V is bounded. Indeed, for any $n \geq 1$ let

$$V_n = (V \wedge n) \vee (-n) - \log \mu(\mathrm{e}^{(V\wedge n)\vee(-n)}).$$

Then $\mu(\mathrm{e}^{V_n}) = 1$, (2.31) holds for V_n in place of V, and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mu(\mathrm{e}^{-2V_n}) = \kappa_2.$$

Thus, applying the assertion to the bounded V_n and letting $n \to \infty$, we complete the proof.

Now, let V be bounded and let $f \in \mathscr{A}$ with $\mu_V(|f|) = 1$. Take $\tilde{f} = f\mathrm{e}^{\frac{V}{2}}$. By (2.31) we have for every $x, y \in \mathrm{supp} q$,

$$\big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{\frac{V(x)-V(y)}{2}}\big)^2 \le \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\kappa_1}\kappa_1^2}{4}\big(1 \wedge d^2(x,y)\big),$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(\tilde{f})(x) &\le 2\int_E \Big\{\mathrm{e}^{V(y)}(f(x)-f(y))^2 + f^2(x)(\mathrm{e}^{\frac{V(x)}{2}} - \mathrm{e}^{\frac{V(y)}{2}})^2\Big\} q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\\ &\le 2\mathrm{e}^{V(x)+\kappa_1}\Gamma(f)(x) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_1^2\lambda \mathrm{e}^{V(x)+\kappa_1} f^2(x).\end{aligned}$$

Since V is bounded, this implies $\tilde{f} \in \mathscr{A}$. Moreover, combining this with (2.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_V(f^2) &= \mu(\tilde{f}^2) \le r\mu(\Gamma(\tilde{f})) + \beta(r)\mu(|\tilde{f}|)^2\\ &\le 2r\mathrm{e}^{\kappa_1}\mathscr{E}_V(f) + r\frac{\kappa_1^2}{2}\lambda\mathrm{e}^{\kappa_1}\mu_V(f^2) + \beta(r)\mu_V(|f|\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{V}{2}})^2.\end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

Since $\mu_V(|f|) = 1$, for any $R > 0$ we have $\mu_V(|f| > R) \le \frac{1}{R}$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_V(|f|\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{V}{2}})^2 &\le 2\mu_V(|f|\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{V}{2}}1_{\{|f|\le R\}})^2 + 2\mu_V(|f|\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{V}{2}}1_{\{|f|\ge R\}})^2\\ &\le 2R\mu_V(|f|^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{V}{2}})^2 + 2\mu_V(f^2)\mu_V(\mathrm{e}^{-V}1_{\{|f|>R\}})\\ &\le 2R\mu_V(|f|)\mu_V(\mathrm{e}^{-V}) + 2\mu_V(f^2)\sqrt{\mu_V(|f|>R)\mu_V(\mathrm{e}^{-2V})}\\ &\le 2R + 2\mu_V(f^2)\frac{\sqrt{\kappa_2}}{\sqrt{R}}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking $R = 16\kappa_2\beta(r)^2$, we get

$$\beta(r)\mu_V(|f|\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{V}{2}})^2 \le 32\kappa_2\beta(r)^3 + \frac{1}{2}\mu_V(f^2).$$

Substituting this into (2.32), we arrive at

$$\mu_V(f^2) \le 4r\mathrm{e}^{\kappa_1}\mathscr{E}_V(f) + r\kappa_1^2\lambda\mathrm{e}^{\kappa_1}\mu_V(f^2) + 64\kappa_2\beta(r)^3.$$

Therefore, for any $s' \in (0, s]$ such that

$$r \le \frac{s'\mathrm{e}^{-\kappa_1}}{4 + \lambda\kappa_1^2 s'},$$

we have

$$\mu_V(f^2) \le s'\mathscr{E}_V(f) + 16\kappa_2\beta(r)^3(4 + \lambda\kappa_1^2 s') \le s\mathscr{E}_V(f) + 16\kappa_2\beta(r)^3(4 + \lambda\kappa_1^2 s').$$

This implies the desired super Poincaré inequality. $\square$

Let $E = \mathbb{R}^m$ and $d(x,y) = |x-y|$. If the jump has a finite range, i.e. there is a constant $k \geq 1$ such that $q(x,y) = 0$ for $|x-y| > k$, then (2.31) holds for any Lipschitz function V. Therefore, the above theorem implies that the super Poincaré inequality is stable for all Lipschitiz perturbations as is known in the diffusion case. In particular, since the defective log-Sobolev inequality

$$\mu(f^2 \log f^2) \leq C_1 \mathscr{E}(f) + C_2, \quad f \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}), \mu(f^2) = 1$$

holds for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$ if and only if the super Poincaré inequality (2.1) holds for $\beta(r) = \mathrm{e}^{c(1+r^{-1})}$ for some $c > 0$, see [13, Corllary 1.1] for $\delta = 1$, we conclude from Theorem 2.9 that the defective log-Sobolev inequality is stable under perturbations of Lipschitz functions V. See [5, Example 1.2] for examples of μ and q having finite range of jumps such that the log-Sobolev inequality holds.

3 Perturbations for the weak Poincaré inequality

Suppose that the weak Poincaré inequality

$$\mu(f^2) \leq \beta(r)\mathscr{E}(f,f) + r\|f\|_\infty^2, \quad r > 0, f \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}), \mu(f) = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

holds for some decreasing function $\beta : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$. To derive the weak Poincaré inequality for $\mathscr{E}_V$ using growth conditions on V, for any $n, k \geq 1$ let

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{K}_{n,k}(V) = \sup_{\rho \leq n} V - \inf_{\rho \leq n+k+1} V, \qquad \tilde{Z}_n(V) = \sup_{\rho \leq n} V, \\
&\tilde{\eta}_{n,k} = \iint_{\{\rho(x) > n+k+1, \rho(y) \leq n+1\}} q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x), \quad \tilde{\gamma}_k = \iint_{\{d(x,y) > k\}} q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x).
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $\tilde{\eta}_{n,k} \leq \tilde{\gamma}_k$. By (1.1) we have $\tilde{\eta}_{n,k} \downarrow 0$ as $n \uparrow \infty$ or $k \uparrow \infty$.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that the weak Poincaré inequality* (3.1) *holds. If for any* $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\inf_{n,k \geq 1} \mathrm{e}^{\tilde{Z}_n(V)} \beta\big(\varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-\tilde{Z}_n(V)}\big)\big(\tilde{\eta}_{n,k} + \tilde{\gamma}_k + \mu(\rho > n-k)\big) = 0, \tag{3.2}$$

then

$$\mu_V(f^2) \leq \beta_V(r)\mathscr{E}_V(f,f) + r\|f\|_\infty^2, \quad r > 0, f \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V), \mu_V(f) = 0 \tag{3.3}$$

holds for

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_V(r) := \inf \Big\{ &2\beta\Big(\frac{r}{8}\mathrm{e}^{-\tilde{Z}_n(V)}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{\tilde{K}_{n,k}(V)} : \ 6\mu_V(\rho > n) \\
&+ 2\mathrm{e}^{\tilde{Z}_n(V)}\beta\Big(\frac{r}{8}\mathrm{e}^{-\tilde{Z}_n(V)}\Big)\big(4\tilde{\eta}_{n,k} + \tilde{\gamma}_k + 4\lambda\mu(\rho > n-k)\big) \leq \frac{r}{2}\Big\} < \infty, \quad r > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. It is easy to see that (3.2) implies $\beta_V(r) < \infty$ for $r > 0$. Let g_n be in the proof of Lemma 2.7. Then for any $f \in \mathscr{A}$ with $\mu_V(f) = 0$, we have

$$\mu_V(fg_n)^2 = \mu_V(f(1-g_n))^2 \le \|f\|_\infty^2 \mu_V(\rho > n)^2.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}_{\mu_V}(fg_n) &\le \mu_V\big((fg_n - \mu(fg_n))^2\big)\\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n} V} \mu\big(1_{\{\rho\le n\}}(fg_n-\mu(fg_n))^2\big) + \mu_V\big(1_{\{\rho>n\}}(fg_n-\mu(fg_n))^2\big)\\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n} V}\mathrm{Var}_\mu(fg_n) + 4\|f\|_\infty^2\mu_V(\rho>n).\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_V(f^2) &\le \mathrm{Var}_{\mu_V}(fg_n) + \mu_V(fg_n)^2 + \mu_V(f^2 1_{\{\rho>n\}})\\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n} V}\mathrm{Var}_\mu(fg_n) + 6\|f\|_\infty^2\mu_V(\rho>n).\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n} V}\mathscr{E}(fg_n) \le &2\mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n} V}\iint_{E\times E} g_n^2(y)(f(x)-f(y))^2 q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x)\\ &+ 2\mathrm{e}^{\sup_{\rho\le n} V}\iint_{E\times E} f^2(x)(g_n(x)-g_n(y))^2 q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x)\\ \le &2\mathrm{e}^{\tilde K_{n,k}(V)}\mathscr{E}_V(f) + 2\mathrm{e}^{\tilde Z_n(V)}(4\tilde\eta_{n,k} + \tilde\gamma_k + 4\lambda\mu(\rho>n-k))\|f\|_\infty^2,\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we made the first integral on the sets $\{\rho(x) \le n+k+1\}$ and $\{\rho(x) > n+k+1\}$, and the second integral on the sets $\{\rho(x)\le n-k\}$ and $\{\rho(x) > n-k\}$, and also used the facts that

$$\begin{aligned}&\iint_{\{\rho(x)>n+k+1\}} g_n^2(y)(f(x)-f(y))^2 q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x) \le \tilde{4}\eta_{n,k}\|f\|_\infty^2,\\ &\iint_{\{\rho(x)\le n-k\}} f^2(x)(g_n(x)-g_n(y))^2 q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x) \le \tilde\gamma_k\|f\|_\infty^2,\\ &\iint_{\{\rho(x)>n-k\}} f^2(x)(g_n(x)-g_n(y))^2 q(x,y)\mu(\mathrm{d}y)\mu(\mathrm{d}x) \le 4\lambda\mu(\rho>n-k)\|f\|_\infty^2.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (3.4) and (3.1), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_V(f^2) \le &2\beta(s)\mathrm{e}^{\tilde K_{n,k}(V)}\mathscr{E}_V(f)\\ &+ \|f\|_\infty^2\big\{6\mu_V(\rho>n) + 4s\mathrm{e}^{\tilde Z_n(V)} + 2\beta(s)\mathrm{e}^{\tilde Z_n(V)}(4\tilde\eta_{n,k} + \tilde\gamma_k + 4\lambda\mu(\rho>n-k))\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

So, for any $r > 0$, let $s = \frac{r}{8}\mathrm{e}^{-\tilde Z_n(V)}$. If for some $n, k \ge 1$ one has

$$6\mu_V(\rho>n) + 2\mathrm{e}^{\tilde Z_n(V)}\beta\Big(\frac{r}{8}\mathrm{e}^{-\tilde Z_n(V)}\Big)\big(4\tilde\eta_{n,k} + \tilde\gamma_k + 4\lambda\mu(\rho>n-k)\big) \le \frac{r}{2},$$

then

$$\mu_V(f^2) \le 2\beta(s)\mathrm{e}^{\tilde K_{n,k}(V)}\mathscr{E}_V(f) + r\|f\|_\infty^2.$$

Therefore, the proof is finished. □

To conclude this section, we present an example where $(\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}))$ satisfies the Poincaré inequality, i.e. the weak Poincaré inequality (3.1) holds for a constant function β.

Example 3.2. Let $E = \mathbb{R}^m$ with $d(x, y) = |x - y|$. Let

$$q(x, y) = \frac{(1 + |y|)^{m+\alpha}}{|x - y|^{-(m+\alpha)}}, \quad \mu(\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{c_{m,\alpha}\mathrm{d}x}{(1 + |x|)^{m+\alpha}}$$

for some constant $0 < \alpha < 2$, where $c_{m,\alpha}$ is a normalizing constant such that μ is a probability measure. Then $\mathscr{A} \supset C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$, and according to [15, Corollary 1.2(1)], (3.1) holds for a constant rate function $\beta(r) \equiv \beta > 0$.

Now, let V be measurable satisfying

$$-s\varepsilon \log(1 + |x|) - K \le V(x) \le (1 - s)\varepsilon \log(1 + |x|) + K, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m \tag{3.5}$$

for some constants $\varepsilon \in [0, \alpha)$, $s \in [0, 1]$ and $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu(e^V) = 1$. Then the weak Poincaré inequality (3.3) holds with

$$\beta_V(r) = C\big(1 + r^{-\varepsilon/(\alpha-(1-s)\varepsilon)}\big) \tag{3.6}$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Moreover, the assertion is sharp in the following two cases with $s = 0$.

(i) β_V in (3.6) is sharp, i.e. β_V can not be replaced by any essentially smaller functions: if

$$\lim_{r\to 0} r^{\varepsilon/(\alpha-\varepsilon)}\beta_V(r) = 0,$$

then the weak Poincaré inequality (3.3) does not hold.

(ii) The constant K can not be replaced by any unbounded functions: for

$$V(x) = \varepsilon \log(1 + |x|) + \phi(|x|) + K_0, \tag{3.7}$$

where $\varepsilon \in [0, \alpha)$, $\phi : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ is an increasing function with $\phi(r) \uparrow \infty$ as $r \uparrow \infty$ such that $\mu(e^{\varepsilon \log(1+|\cdot|)+\phi(|\cdot|)}) < \infty$, and $K_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is such that $\mu(e^V) = 1$, the weak Poincaré inequality (3.3) with the rate function β_V given by (3.6) does not hold.

Proof. Take $k = \frac{n}{2}$. Then there is a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that for n large enough

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{K}_{n,\frac{n}{2}}(V) \le \varepsilon \log(1 + n) + c_1, \quad \tilde{Z}_n(V) \le \varepsilon(1 - s)\log(1 + n) + c_1,\\ &\tilde{\eta}_{n,\frac{n}{2}} + \tilde{\gamma}_{\frac{n}{2}} + \mu\big(\rho > \frac{n}{2}\big) \le \frac{c_1}{n^\alpha}, \quad \mu_V(\rho > n) \le \frac{c_1}{n^{\alpha-(1-s)\varepsilon}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon \in [0, \alpha)$, we see that (3.2) holds and there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$6\mu_V(\rho > n) + 2\beta \mathrm{e}^{\tilde{Z}_n(V)}\big(4\tilde{\eta}_{n,\frac{n}{2}} + \tilde{\gamma}_{\frac{n}{2}} + 4\lambda\mu(\rho > \frac{n}{2})\big) \le \frac{c_2}{2n^{\alpha-(1-s)\varepsilon}}, \quad n \ge 1.$$

Thus, in the definition of β_V for small $r > 0$ we may take $n = (\frac{c_2}{r})^{\frac{1}{\alpha-(1-s)\varepsilon}}$ to get

$$\beta_V(r) \le 2\beta \mathrm{e}^{\tilde{K}_{n,\frac{n}{2}}(V)} \le c_3 r^{-\varepsilon/(\alpha-(1-s)\varepsilon)}$$

for some constant $c_3 > 0$. Therefore, there exists $C > 0$ such that the weak Poincaré inequality (3.3) holds for β_V given in (3.6).

It remains to verify (i) and (ii), where the assertion (i) has been included in [15, Corollary 1.2(3)]. So, it suffices to consider (ii). Now, assume that the weak Poincaré inequality holds for $(\mathscr{E}_V, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_V))$ with the rate function

$$\beta_V(r) = c_4(1 + r^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha-\varepsilon}})$$

for some constant $c_4 > 0$. For any $n \ge 1$, let $f_n \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be in part (b) of the proof of Example 2.3. By (2.11) and noting that $\mu_V(f_n)^2 \le \frac{1}{2}\mu_V(f_n^2)$ for large n, there exist constants $c_5, c_6 > 0$ such that for n large enough,

$$\mathscr{E}_V(f_n) \le c_5 n^{-\alpha}, \quad \mu_V(f_n^2) - \mu_V(f_n)^2 \ge \frac{c_6 \mathrm{e}^{\phi(n)}}{n^{\alpha-\varepsilon}}.$$

Combining these with (3.3), we obtain that there exists $c_7 > 0$ such that for all $r > 0$ and for n large enough,

$$\frac{c_7 \mathrm{e}^{\phi(n)}}{n^{\alpha-\varepsilon}} \le \frac{\beta_V(r)}{n^\alpha} + r.$$

Taking $r = \frac{c_7}{2}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{\phi(n)}}{n^{\alpha-\varepsilon}}$ in the inequality above, we arrive at

$$\beta_V\Big(\frac{c_7}{2}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{\phi(n)}}{n^{\alpha-\varepsilon}}\Big) \ge \frac{c_7}{2} n^\varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{\phi(n)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Since there is $c_8 > 0$ such that for n large enough

$$\frac{\mathrm{e}^{\phi(n)}}{n^{\alpha-\varepsilon}} \le c_8 \int_{\{|x|\ge n\}} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\phi(|x|)}}{(1+|x|)^{m+\alpha-\varepsilon}}\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

it holds that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\phi(n)}}{n^{\alpha-\varepsilon}} = 0,$$

which, along with the definition of β_V, yields that there is a constant $c_9 > 0$ such that for n large enough

$$\beta_V\Big(\frac{c_7 \mathrm{e}^{\phi(n)}}{2n^{\alpha-\varepsilon}}\Big) \le c_9 n^\varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-\varepsilon\phi(n)/(\alpha-\varepsilon)},$$

which is a contradiction to (3.8) since $\lim_{r\to\infty}\phi(r) = \infty$. Therefore, the weak Poincaré inequality does not hold with the rate function (3.6). □

References

[1] D. Bakry, *L'hypercontractivité et son utilisation en théorie des semigroups,* Lecture Notes in Math. 1581, pp. 1–114, Springer, Berlin, 1994.

[2] D. Bakry, M. Ledoux, F.-Y. Wang, *Perturbations of functional inequalities using growth conditions,* J. Math. Pures Appl. 87(2007), 394–407.

[3] P. Cattiaux, A. Guillin, F.-Y. Wang, L. Wu, *Lyapunov conditions for Super Poincaré inequalties,* J. Funct. Anal. 256(2009), 1821–1841.

[4] X. Chen, J. Wang, *Weighted Poincaré inequalities for non-local Dirichlet forms,* arXiv:1207.7140.

[5] X. Chen, J. Wang, *Functional inequalities for nonlocal Dirichlet forms with finite range jumps or large jumps,* arXiv:1212.6100.

[6] E. B. Davies, *Heat Kernels and Spectral Theory,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.

[7] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima, M. Takeda, *Dirichlet Forms and Symmetric Markov Processes*, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2011, 2nd.

[8] L. Gross, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and contractivity properties of semigroups,* Lecture Notes in Math. 1563, pp. 54–88, Springer, Berlin, 1993.

[9] A. Guillin, C. Léonard, L. Wu, N. Yao, *Transportation inequalities for Markov processes, Probab. Theory Related Fields,* 144(2009), 669-695.

[10] C. Mouhot, E. Russ, Y. Sire, *Fractional Poincaré inequalities for general measures,* J. Math. Pures Appl. 95(2011), 72–84.

[11] M. Röckner, F.-Y. Wang, *Weak Poincaré inequalities and L^2-convergence rates of Markov semigroups,* J. Funct. Anal. 185(2001), 564–603.

[12] F.-Y. Wang, *Functional inequalities for empty essential spectrum,* J. Funct. Anal. 170(2000), 219–245.

[13] F.-Y. Wang, *Functional inequalities, semigroup properties and spectrum estimates,* Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quant. Probab. Relat. Topics 3(2000), 263–295.

[14] F.-Y. Wang, *Functional Inequalities, Markov Processes and Spectral Theory*, Science Press, Beijing, 2005.

[15] F.-Y. Wang, J. Wang, *Functional inequalities for stable-like Dirichlet forms*, arXiv:1205.4508.